

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants have amended the specification to correct an inadvertent typographical error in Applicants' reference to the provisional application from which Applicants claim priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) in the specification. In reply to the Office Action dated September 29, 2005, Applicants amended the specification to include a reference to the priority claim to U.S. Provisional Application 60/198,818 filed on April 21, 2000. (Reply to Office Action dated September 29, 2005, pgs. 2-3). However, it has come to Applicants' attention that the application number in the amendment included a typographical error, and the correct provisional application number is "60/198,819" In this Amendment with RCE, Applicants have amended the specification to correct this typographical error.¹

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4-6, 8-13, 55-56, 58, 60-66, 68-73, 115-116, 118, 120-122, 126-128, 130-135, 177-178, 180, and 182-184 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,146,403 to Goodman ("*Goodman*") and U.S. Patent Application Publ. No. 2002/0103697 to Lockhart et al. ("*Lockhart et al.*"); rejected claims 7, 14-20, 59, 67, 74-80, 119, 129, 136-142, and 181 under under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of *Goodman*, *Lockhart et al.*, and U.S. Patent No. 6,654,779 to Tsuei ("*Tsuei*"); and rejected claims 57, 117, and 179 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of *Goodman*, *Lockhart et al.*, and U.S. Patent

¹ Applicants' representatives telephoned the Examiner to discuss correcting this typographical error on January 31, 2007, and left a voicemail message, but were unable to talk directly with the Examiner before filing this Amendment.

Application Publ. No. 2001/0037463 to Salta ("*Salta*").² For the reasons that follow, Applicants traverse these rejections.

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 4-6, 8, 14, 20, 55, 63, 66, 68, 74, 115, 126-128, 130, 136, and 177 to more clearly recite the subject matter of the invention. Support for Applicants' claim amendments can be found, for example, in the specification in paragraphs [041] - [044], Fig. 7 and related text, and original claim 5. Claim 20 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Applicants have also canceled claims 1-3, 21-54, 81-114, 123-125, and 143-176, which were previously withdrawn due to a restriction requirement. By this amendment, claims 4-20, 55-80, 115-122, 126-142, and 177-184 remain pending in this application.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 4-6, 8-13, 55-56, 58, 60-66, 68-73, 115-116, 118, 120-122, 126-128, 130-135, 177-178, 180, and 182-184 in view of *Goodman and Lockhart et al.*

Applicants traverse the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection in view of *Goodman and Lockhart et al.* at least for the reason that *Goodman and Lockhart et al.*, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the claim elements recited in claims 4-6, 8-13, 55-56, 58, 60-66, 68-73, 115-116, 118, 120-122, 126-128, 130-135, 177-178, 180, and 182-184.

Amended independent claim 4 recites, *inter alia*, "creating a first change of address record at the change of address server representing the change of address information," "electronically transferring the first change of address record to a service

² To the extent that the Examiner characterizes the claims and teachings of the references in the Office Action, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to such characterizations.

center when the identity is valid,” “creating a second change of address record at the service center by modifying the first change of address record received from the change of address server,” “forwarding the second change of address record electronically from the service center...,” and “processing, by the forwarding service unit, the second change of address record received from the service center electronically to automatically redirect mail....” Amended independent claims 6, 8, 55, 63, 66, 68, 115, 126, 128, 130, and 177 recite similar features. *Goodman* fails to teach or suggest at least these elements of claim 4. Nor does *Lockhart et al.* cure this deficiency.

Goodman discloses a change of address system including change of address terminals connected to a master service computer, as shown in Figure 1. The terminals receive and store customized change of address information for a user. (Col. 2, lines 40-42). The master service computer receives the change of address information from the terminals, and the postal service is notified of the change of address. (Col. 2, lines 43-48). The master service computer may communicate directly with the postal service, and the postal service computer may communicate with one or more of a group of individual postal service computers to notify local postal authorities of the change in a customer’s address. (Col. 6, lines 57-65).

Goodman, however, does not disclose, among other things, “creating a second change of address record at the service center by modifying the first change of address record received from the change of address server,” or the recited forwarding and processing of the second change of address record. Even if *Goodman*’s change of address report were considered a first change of address record, (e.g., change of

address report 299 created at the master service computer 9 (Fig. 21; col. 10, lines 5-21)), *Goodman* contains no teaching or suggestion of a second change of address record that is created, forwarded, and processed to automatically redirect mail, as recited in claim 4 (and similar recitations in the other independent claims). To the contrary, *Goodman* teaches away from creating a second change of address record because *Goodman* teaches that the purpose of creating the change of address report 299 is for the subscriber mailer to “receive a single summarize report which lists a number of customers, clients, etc. who are changing their mailing address.” (Col. 10, lines 18-21).

Furthermore, these features of the claims are also not disclosed or suggested in *Lockhart et al.* *Lockhart et al.* discloses a system for generating and distributing surface mail using a global computer network. [0003]. A user specifies the contents of an electronic mail file intended for a particular recipient. [0022]. A mail service computer sends the file to a printing facility [0023], and the mail item is then placed into the surface mail system [0024]. In accordance with one aspect of the alleged invention of *Lockhart et al.*, an address-change form is supplied to the user on-line. [0091]. Information is then suitably validated and transmitted to the post office data center for update. [0091]. Thus, *Lockhart et al.*, also fails to disclose, among other things, “creating a second change of address record by modifying the first change of address record received from the change of address server” or the recited forwarding and processing of the second change of address record.

For at least the foregoing reasons, *Goodman* and *Lockhart et al.*, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the claim elements recited in independent claims 4, 6, 8, 55, 63, 66, 68, 115, 126, 128, 130, and 177, and these claims are allowable over the prior art of record. Similarly dependent claims 5, 9-13, 56, 58, 60-62, 54, 65, 69-73, 116, 118, 120-122, 127, 131-135, 178, 180, and 182-184 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from the allowable independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants request the withdrawal of the Section 103 rejections of claims 4-6, 8-13, 55-56, 58, 60-66, 68-73, 115-116, 118, 120-122, 126-128, 130-135, 177-178, 180, and 182-184.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 7, 14-20, 59, 67, 74-80, 119, 129, 136-142, and 181 in view of *Goodman*, *Lockhart et al.*, and *Tsuei*

Applicants traverse the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection in view of *Goodman*, *Lockhart et al.*, and *Tsue* at least for the reason that *Goodman*, *Lockhart et al.*, and *Tsue*, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the claim elements recited in claims 7, 14-20, 59, 67, 74-80, 119, 129, 136-142, and 181.

Amended independent claim 14, recites, *inter alia*, "creating a first change of address record at the change of address server representing the change of address information," "electronically transferring the first change of address record to a service center if the identity is valid," "creating a second change of address record at the service center by modifying the first change of address record received from the change of address server," and "processing, at a forwarding service unit, the second change of address record received from the service center electronically to automatically redirect

mail” Although of different scope, amended independent claims 74 and 136 recite similar features, as do independent claims 6, 55, 66, 115, 128, and 177.

For the reasons discussed above, *Goodman* and *Lockhart et al.*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least these features of the independent claims. Nor does *Tsuei* teach or suggest these features.

Tsuei discloses an e-mail address management system (“EAMS”) (Fig. 3; col. 6, lines 16-20). An e-mail address change may be registered with the EAMS by a recipient or by an internet service provider (“ISP”). (Col. 10, lines 12-20). Once the e-mail address change is registered with the EAMS, the EAMS may send a new e-mail address over the internet back to the sender ISP so that the sender ISP can forward the e-mail to the recipient’s new e-mail address. (Col. 10, lines 12-37). Thus, *Tsuei*, fails to disclose, among other things, “creating a second change of address record by modifying the first change of address record received from the change of address server” or the recited forwarding and processing of the second change of address record.

For at least the foregoing reasons, *Goodman*, *Lockhart et al.*, and *Tsuei*, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the claim elements recited in independent claims 14, 74, 136, and the other independent claims enumerated above, and these claims are allowable over the prior art of record. Similarly, dependent claims 7, 15-20, 59, 67, 75-80, 119, 129, 137-142, and 181 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from the allowable independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants

request the withdrawal of the Section 103 rejections of claims 7, 14-20, 59, 67, 74-80, 119, 129, 136-142, and 181.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 57, 117, and 179 in view of *Goodman*, *Lockhart et al.*, and *Salta*

Dependent claims 57, 117, and 179 depend from independent claims 55, 115, and 177, respectively. As discussed above, independent claims 55, 115, 177 are patentable over the alleged combination of *Goodman* and *Lockhart et al.* Thus, at least by virtue of their dependencies from allowable independent claims 55, 115, and 177, the above-listed dependent claims are also be patentable over *Goodman*, *Lockhart et al.*, and *Salta*, and Applicants request the withdrawal of the Section 103 rejections of claims 57, 117, and 179.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 8, 2007

By: William J. Brogan
William J. Brogan
Reg. No. 43,515